UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,533	10/20/2003	Tsutomu Sakaue	CANO:094	9332

7590 08/09/2006

ROSSI & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 826
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826

EXAMINER	
WANG, ALBERT C	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2115	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/689,533	SAKAUE, TSUTOMU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Albert Wang	2115	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-9,13,14 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-9,13,14 and 16-19 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 October 2003 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to the amendment filed 16 May 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 2, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 claims a receiving unit that is separate from a transmitting unit. However, the specification teaching only a single unit that performs both sending and receiving functions (fig. 2, communication control section 208; page 18, lines 21-25). Claim 2 elaborates on the receiving unit of claim 1.

Claims 18 and 19 are directed to a terminal apparatus for remotely controlling a multifunction printer. Details of such an apparatus are lacking (fig. 2, personal computers 112; page 11, lines 17-27). For instance, the specification does not expressly teach the corresponding display unit, display control unit, separate receiving and transmission units, and selecting unit. Moreover, the claims seem to indicate that a display unit located on the multifunction printer displays the power status information. There is no indication of such a display (fig. 2).

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 8, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships in claim 1 are: whether "the display unit" in lines 8 and 14 refers to "a display unit" in line 3 or "a display unit of the external device" in line 7. Claim 18 also seems to have two different display units.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "said generating unit" in line 10.

Claim 19 recites the limitations "said external apparatus" in line 3 and "said selecting unit" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13, 14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iida, U.S. Patent No. 6,785,023, in view of Chang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,507,273 ("Chang").

As per claim 1, Iida teaches an information processing apparatus having a plurality of functions and connected with an external apparatus via a network (fig. 3, network facsimile 201 connected with client machine 202), comprising:

a display unit (fig. 2, panel section 7);

a display control unit that causes said display unit to display the plurality of functions in a manner being selectable (fig. 2, CPU 1; col. 3, lines 23-40);

a generating unit that generates a file including first information that causes a display unit of the external apparatus to display power status information of the plurality of functions and second information that causes the display unit of the external device to display setting information for setting at least a parameter of the plurality of functions (fig. 4, HTML file generating section 11; figs. 6 & 7, page with power status information and setting information; col. 3, lines 51-55; col. 4, lines 11-19; col. 5, lines 4-14);

a transmission/receiving unit that transmits the file generated by generating unit to the external apparatus, and that receives information indicating at least one function selected from the plurality of functions via the setting information displayed by the display unit based on the second information (fig. 4, server section 12; col. 4, lines 24-46); and

However, Iida does not expressly teach the setting information is for controlling the power status of at least one function. Chang teaches using setting information for controlling the power status of a device (figs. 1 & 2, controlling power status of device 90 via network; col. 3, lines 20-65). Chang teaches further a power supply control unit (fig. 2, switch 160). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Chang's

power status control to Iida's apparatus. A motivation would have been to facilitate remote power control (Chang, col. 1, lines 8-24).

As per claim 2, Chang teaches displaying types of power supply control corresponding to at least one function in a manner being selectable; and said power supply control unit controls the power supply based on the information on the at least one function and information on the types of power supply control corresponding to the at least one function (col. 3, lines 20-65).

As per claim 6, Iida teaches an image processing apparatus having image forming unit for forming an image (fig. 2).

As per claim 7, Iida teaches the plurality of functions comprise at least two functions selected from the group consisting of a printing function, a facsimile function, a copying function, and a scanner function (fig. 2).

As per claim 16, Iida teaches said generating unit generates the file in response to a request to view the file to be genera generated, the request being made by the external apparatus (fig. 5).

As per claim 17, Iida teaches the file is written in a markup language and the external apparatus includes a browsing unit for browsing the file on the display unit (col. 5, lines 40-53).

As per claim 8, Iida teaches a power supply control method for an information processing apparatus having a plurality of functions and connected with an external apparatus via a network, comprising the steps of:

generating a file including first information that causes a display unit of the external apparatus to display power status information of the plurality of functions and second

information that causes the display unit to display setting information for setting at least power status of the plurality of functions (figs. 6 & 7, page with power status information and setting information; col. 3, lines 51-55; col. 4, lines 11-19; col. 5, lines 4-14 & 40-67);

transmitting the file generated by said generating unit to the external apparatus (fig. 5, step 404); and

receiving information indicating at least one function selected from the plurality of functions via a screen the setting information displayed by the display unit (fig. 5, receiving request of step 406).

However, Iida does not expressly teaches controlling power supply relating to the at least one function indicated by the received information. Chang teaches using received information for controlling the power status of a device (figs. 1 & 2, controlling power status of device 90 via network; col. 3, lines 20-65). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Chang's controlling power supply to Iida's method. A motivation would have been to facilitate remote power control (Chang, col. 1, lines 8-24).

As per claim 8, Chang teaches displaying types of power supply control corresponding to at least one function in a manner being selectable; and controlling the power supply relating the at least one function based on the information on the at least one function and information on the types of power supply control corresponding to the at least one function (col. 3, lines 20-65).

As per claim 13, Iida teaches the information processing apparatus is implemented by an image processing apparatus having image forming unit for forming an image (fig. 2).

As per claim 14, Iida teaches the plurality of functions comprise at least two functions selected from the group consisting of a printing function, a facsimile function, a copying function, and a scanner function (fig. 2).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Albert Wang whose telephone number is 571-272-3669. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 - 6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas C. Lee can be reached on 571-272-3667. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AW

THOMAS LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100